



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/743,637	12/22/2003	Christopher D. Payne	MSFTP513US	7416

27195 7590 02/23/2006

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER
1900 EAST NINTH STREET
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER

CHAKRABORTY, SUPRATIK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2672

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/743,637	Applicant(s) PAYNE ET AL.	
	Examiner Supratik Chakraborty	Art Unit 2672	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/13/2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

2. Claims 1,2,4,13,37,38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Caid et al. (Patent# 5,79,4,178) further in view of Cudd et al. (Pub. # US 2004/0105127 A1).

In regard to claim 1,Caid et al teaches about an analysis component that analyzes data corresponding to a plurality of web pages, the plurality of web pages comprising at least a current web page, to facilitate identifying at least one section of the current web page (col.2, lines 20-23). Although the 'analysis component' hasn't been explicitly mentioned, the context vector, as taught by the reference provides a context-sensitive

Art Unit: 2672

information retrieval, routing and visualization system based on the learned similarity of meaning.

Caid et al. teach all the limitations except the parsing component that dissects the current web page to remove at least one identifiable section from printable view, the at least one section being non-essential to defining content of the current web page.

Cudd et al. mentions the above limitation in (page 3, [0058]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply within the analysis component as taught by Caid et al., the dissection of the current web page as taught by Cudd et al. in order to make an identifiable section appear or disappear based on the extent to which content within the frame (section) is able to be presented in its entirety. Although Cudd et al doesn't explicitly mention anything about the parsing component, the definition of parsing is the breaking of data into smaller, more distinct chunks of information that can be more easily interpreted and acted upon. The reference teaches about the identification of the frame scroll bar, that is a subset of information, and is acted upon by removing it based on the size of the window, therefore it corresponds to the claimed parsing component.

In regard to claim 2, Cudd et al further teach about a preview component that visualizes a preview version of the printable page for the web user (page 3, [0053]).

Art Unit: 2672

In regard to claim 4, Cudd et al teach that the preview component allows the web user to verify whether the parsing component dissected the current web page according to user preferences (page 3, [0053]).

In regard to claim 13, Cudd et al. teach non-essential data comprising advertisements and navigation information (Fig. 2B;Page 3, [0058]). Scroll bars can be interpreted as non-essential data since scroll bars consist of navigation information.

In regard to claim 37, the combination of Cudd et al. and Caid et al. teach all the limitations of claim 37. Cudd et al teach about the user acquiring a webpage residing in a server (page 3, [0052]) that corresponds to the claimed data packet transmitted between two or more computer processes.

Caid et al uses the context vectors to identify the content (col.2, lines 22-23) that can be utilized by Cudd et al's method to remove the content. The identified content can be a scroll-bar.

In regard to claim 38, the combination of Cudd et al. and Caid et al. teach all the limitations of claim 38.

3. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Caid et al. (Patent # 5,794,178) in view of Cudd et al. (Pub No. 2004/0105127 A1) as applied to claims 1,2,4,13,37,38 above, and further in view of Foster et al (Patent# 5,404,442).

In regard to claim 3, the combination of Caid et al and Cudd et al. teach all the limitations except the preview component allows the web user to modify the printable page according to user preferences.

Foster et al mentions the above limitation in (col. 3, lines 12-20).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to apply within the combination as taught by Caid et al. and Cudd et al. the modification of the printable page as taught by Foster et al to provide a method moving or copying objects in a graphical user interface with visual feedback capability.

4. Claims 5-9,12 and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Caid et al. (Patent # 5,794,178) in view of Cudd et al. (Pub No. 2004/0105127 A1) as applied to claims 1,2,4,13,37,38 above, and further in view of O'Brien et al (Pub. No.: 2004/0139169 A1).

In regard to claim 5, the combination of Caid et al. and Cudd et al. teach all the limitations except that the plurality of web pages further comprises at least one web page in addition to the current web page to facilitate deciphering architecture of the current web page.

O'Brien et al. teaches the above limitation in (page 2, [0028]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to apply within the combination as taught by Caid et al. and Cudd et al., the architecture deciphering

Art Unit: 2672

technique as taught by O'Brien et al. in order to extract the object corresponding to the desired web fragment from the set of objects and return it to the requestor.

O'Brien et al teach about the web fragment objects (WFO) that helps in locating a web-fragment. This corresponds to the claimed limitation of a plurality of webpages in addition to the current web page that helps in deciphering the architecture of the current web page.

In regard to claim 6, O'Brien et al. further teach the analysis component analyzes at least one of text density, key word density, key word frequency, table structure, location of dense text, location of one or more table, presence of one or more images, location of one or more images, dimensions of one or more images, and dimensions of one or more tables. Analysis of the table structure is mentioned in (page 4, [0048]). The reference teaches about the image within the table that corresponds to the claimed presence of one or more images.

In regard to claim 7, O' Brien et al teach that the parsing component identifies one or more sections of the current web page based at least in part upon a portion of the data from the current web page that has been analyzed by the analysis component (page 7, [0095]).

In regard to claim 8, O'Brien et al teach that the parsing component labels one or more identified sections on the current web page with one or more visual references to assist

Art Unit: 2672

the web user in determining whether to remove one or more identified sections from the printable view (page 3, [0046]). O'Brien et al teaches about visual cues to identify web fragments or the desired web fragments.

In regard to claim 9, O'Brien et al teach that the parsing component labels one or more identified sections on the current web page with one or more textual references to assist the web user in determining whether to remove one or more identified sections from the printable view (page 7, [0096]). The textual references are denoted by FILS in the prior art. FILS are instructions used to extract web fragments.

In regard to claim 12, O'Brien et al further teach about a feed monitoring component that monitors data from one or more feeds to facilitate deciphering content on at least the current web page for analysis by the analysis component (page 2, [0027]).

In regard to claim 14, O'Brien et al teach about a user selection component that allows the web user to select which identifiable sections to keep or remove from the printable view (page 4, [0062]). O'Brien et al teach about the preview window which helps the user evaluate whether the web-fragment is to be added or removed.

In regard to claim 15, O'Brien et al teach that the printable view is a preview version of a print copy of the current web page (page 4, [0062]).

In regard to claim 16, O'Brien et al teach that the printable view corresponding to any one of following as chosen by the web user: one or more sections selected by the parsing component to be retained for printing, the current web page as it appears, and one or more sections of the current web page fit to a number of pages according to user preferences (Figure 3). O' brien et al in (Fig.3, 132) teach about the option of selecting WFI by the user that corresponds to the claimed user selecting the components.

In regard to claim 17, the combination of Cudd et al. and O'Brien et al teach all the limitations. Although Cudd et al doesn't explicitly mention anything about the parsing component, the definition of parsing is the breaking of data into smaller, more distinct chunks of information that can be more easily interpreted and acted upon. The reference teaches about the identification of the frame scroll bar, that is a subset of information, and is acted upon by removing it based on the size of the window, therefore it corresponds to the claimed parsing component.

In regard to claim 18, Caid et al. teach that the AI component comprising a classifier (col. 5, lines 23-26). The reference teaches about the context generation scheme that produces vectors based on proximity of meaning or content among documents.

In regard to claim 19, O'Brien et al teach that the AI component inferring at least one of the following:

When to employ user preferences,

Art Unit: 2672

When to override user preferences,

When to compare data from the current web page and the at least one other web page; and

When to remove one or more sections from the preview version.

Removing sections from the preview version is mentioned in (page 4, [0062]).

In regard to claim 20, Caid et al. teach that the AI component comprising at least one of: a support vector machine (SVM), a naïve Bayes model, a Bayesian network, a decision tree, a Hidden Markov Model (HMM), neural network, data fusion engine. Context vector generation schemes using neural networks are mentioned in (col. 2, lines 20-24).

5. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Caid et al. (Patent # 5,794,178) in view of Cudd et al. (Pub No. 2004/0105127 A1) as applied to claims 1,2,4,13,37,38 above, and further in view of Chakrabarti et al (Patent # 6,418,433 B1).

In regard to claim 10, the combination of Caid et al. and Cudd et al. teach all the limitations except a crawler component that provides data for analysis by the analysis component.

Chakrabarti et al. mentions the above limitation in (col. 3, lines 4-11)

Art Unit: 2672

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply within the system as taught by Caid et al. and Cudd et al., the crawler mechanism as taught by Chakrabarti et al. to implement computer readable code means for evaluating web-pages.

In regard to claim 11, Chakrabarti et al. further teach that a cache component operatively connected to the crawler component, the cache component comprising one or more web pages stored for comparison to one or more updated pages that correspond thereto to facilitate determining location of content (col. 5, lines 18-24). The reference mentions the 'crawl database' that is implemented on a RAM of a computer, which is a known embodiment of a cache.

6. Claims 21,22,25,26,28,29,30,31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manber et al. (Patent No. 6,920,609 B1) further in view of Caid et al. (Patent# 5,79,4,178) .

In regard to claim 21, Manber et al. teach a method that provides a plurality of web pages. The plurality of web pages is mentioned in (col. 3, lines 4-16).

Manber et al. also mentions the generation of a subset of the web pages to facilitate generating a user-defined printable page (col. 2, lines 60-63).

Manber et al. addresses all the limitations except the analysis of the plurality of web pages to facilitate identifying content and determining location of the content.

Art Unit: 2672

Caid et al. teaches the above limitation in (col.2, lines 20-23).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply within the plurality of web pages as suggested by Manber et al., the analysis of the plurality of web pages as taught by Caid et al in order to have an improved system for generating and retrieving pertinent content from high-dimensional abstractions of information content.

Manber et al teach the identification and extraction of content from the web pages.

Manber et al also teach about the selection of desired content from the web page that corresponds to the claimed generating a page by partitioning and removing the atleast one non essential sector from atleast one current web page.

In regard to claim 22, Manber et al further teach that the plurality of web pages comprising at least a current web page and at least one other web page (col.3, lines 5-14).

In regard to claim 25, Manber et al further teach that determining layout structure of at least a subset of the web pages based at least in part on content identified thereon (col. 3, lines 25-40).

In regard to claim 26, the combination of Caid et al., Manber et al. and Cudd et al. teach all the limitations of the claim.

Art Unit: 2672

In regard to claim 28, Manber et al further teach dissecting the current web based at least in part upon user preferences (col. 2, lines 47-51).

In regard to claim 29, Manber et al further teach collecting one or more current web pages and organizing the one or more current web pages, thereby generating a new printable document comprising at least a subset of the current web pages based at least in part upon user preferences (col. 3, lines 4-16).

In regard to claim 30, Cudd et al teach printing the printable page to at least one of the following: to file, to printer, to email system, and to facsimile device (page 4, [0066]).

In regard to claim 31, Manber et al teach that the identifiable content comprises of advertisements, images, navigation, body of text, dynamic text (col.2, lines 29-37).

7. Claims 23,30,39,40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manber et al. (Patent No. 6,920,609 B1) further in view of Caid et al. (Patent# 5,79,4,178) as applied to claims 21,22,25,26,28,29,31 above, and further in view of Cudd et al (Pub No. 2004/0105127) .

In regard to claim 23, the combination of Manber et al and Caid et al. teach all the limitations except printing the current web page as it appears on screen.

Cudd et al. teach the above limitation in (page 4, [0066]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply within the combination of Manber et al. and Caid et al. the printing of the current web page as taught by Cudd et al to provide a hardcopy of the webpage.

In regard to claim 39, the combination of Manber et al and Cudd et al teach all the limitations of the claim. Cudd et al mentions printing out the web page in (page 4, [0066]). The means for analyzing the plurality of web pages to facilitate identifying content and determining location of the content on at least a subset of the web pages to facilitate generating a user-defined printable page is mentioned in Fig. 2 of Manber et al. Manber et al teach about the selection of desired content from the web page (col.3, lines 28-29) that corresponds to the claimed removal of at least one part of the webpage from the printable view.

The reference (Manber et al) teaches about HTML formatted webpage that consists of a plurality of HTML tags (col.3, lines 31-33). These tags are known to demarcate the webpage, therefore it corresponds to the claimed partitioning.

In regard to claim 40, Manber et al further teach the means for analyzing the plurality of web pages to facilitate identifying content and determining location of the content on at least a subset of the web pages to facilitate generating a user-defined printable page (col. 3, lines 25-40).

8. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manber et al. (Patent No. 6,920,609 B1) further in view of Caid et al. (Patent# 5,79,4,178) as applied to claims 21,22,25,26,28,29,31 above, and further in view of O'Brien et al (Pub No. 2004/0139169).

In regard to claim 24, the combination of Manber et al and Caid et al. teach all the limitations except analyzing the plurality of web pages for at least one of the following to facilitate identifying content and determining location of the content: text density, key word density, key word frequency, table structure, location of dense text, location of one or more table, presence of one or more images, location of one or more images, dimensions of one or more images, and dimensions of one or more tables.

O'Brien et al. teach the above limitation in (page 5, [0048]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply within the combination of Manber et al. and Caid et al. the determination of the location of the table structure as taught by O'Brien et al. to decompose the webpage based on predefined object types.

9. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manber et al. (Patent No. 6,920,609 B1) further in view of Caid et al. (Patent# 5,79,4,178) as

Art Unit: 2672

applied to claims 21,22,25,26,28,29,31 above, and further in view of Foster et al (Patent No. 5,404,442).

In regard to claim 27, the combination of Manber et al and Caid et al. teach all the limitations except modifying the preview version based at least in part upon user preferences.

Foster et al. teach the above limitation in (col.3, lines 12-20).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply within the combination of Manber et al. and Caid et al. the modification of the preview version as taught by Foster et al. to provide a method moving or copying objects in a graphical user interface with visual feedback capability.

10. Claims 32-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manber et al. (Patent No. 6,920,609 B1) further in view of Caid et al. (Patent# 5,79,4,178) as applied to claims 21,22,25,26,28,29,31 above, and further in view of Brown et al (Patent No. 6,356,908 B1).

Art Unit: 2672

In regard to claim 32, the combination of Manber et al and Caid et al. teach all the limitations except adding a thumbnail reference to the preview version comprising an image of the current web page in its original state.

Brown et al. teach the above limitation in (Fig.11).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply within the combination of Manber et al. and Caid et al. the thumbnail generation method as taught by Brown et al to visually indicate the relevance of a webpage.

In regard to claim 33, Brown et al. teach adding a page summary to the preview version comprising a URL and a print date (col. 8, lines 6-27).

In regard to claim 34, the combination of Manber et al. and Brown et al. addresses the limitations of the claim. Manber et al teach the subset of content parsed from a web page in (col.3, lines 5-15). Fig. 8 in Brown et al. teaches the thumbnail reference of the web page and a summary of the web page.

In regard to claim 35, Manber et al teach that the content is user-defined content (col. 2, lines 47-52). The reference teaches the extraction of information (content) after minimal manual setup that corresponds to the extraction of information (content) after minimal manual setup.

Art Unit: 2672

In regard to claim 36, Brown et al teach that the print preview page has a summary comprising a URL, of the web page and a date on which the web page is accessed (Fig. 8).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/16/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Caid et al and

Art Unit: 2672

Cudd et al in combination teach or suggest all aspects recited in the claims 1,2,4,13,37, and 38.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Pub. No. US 2001/0044810 A1 deals with dynamic content retrieval.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Art Unit: 2672

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Supratik Chakraborty whose telephone number is (571) 272-7662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (7:30 am - 3:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi can be reached on (571) 272-7664. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ge
S.Chakraborty
1/24/06


1/30/06
RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600